

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of KEEONA SHAYAME  
HOUSEMAN, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JEREMY SHERWOOD,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

August 2, 2005

No. 260246

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-054841-NA

---

In the Matter of WESTON DALE SHERWOOD,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JEREMY SHERWOOD,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

No. 260247

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-054839-NA

Before: Zahra, P.J., and Gage and Murray, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent appeals as of right from two orders terminating his parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii) (desertion), (c)(i) (conditions leading to adjudication continue to exist), (c)(ii) (other conditions exist), and (g) (failure to provide proper care and custody). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 209-210; 661 NW2d 216 (2003). The evidence, including respondent's own testimony, demonstrated that respondent failed to visit or even contact the children for several months before the termination trial. Despite respondent having been given several opportunities to take advantage of visitation, he failed to do so. Therefore, the evidence demonstrated that respondent deserted his minor children. Furthermore, respondent also failed to actively participate in the parenting support group he was required to attend and, therefore, failed to address the major issue leading to adjudication – domestic violence. Respondent also testified regarding his sporadic employment and housing situations. These “other conditions” were properly considered in terminating respondent's parental rights. Thus, the evidence demonstrated that respondent was not in a position to provide the children with proper care or custody and that the conditions leading to adjudication, as well as other conditions, continued to exist. Therefore, the trial court did not clearly err by finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence.

Additionally, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the evidence failed to show that termination of respondent's parental rights was not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Respondent failed to see the children for a number of months and there was evidence that the children did not ask about respondent. Respondent failed to participate in the proceedings in any meaningful way. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra  
/s/ Hilda R. Gage  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray